	E95AABENP	Plea	
1	UNITED STATES DIST SOUTHERN DISTRICT		
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT		
3	UNITED STATES OF A	AMERICA,	
4	V.		14 CR 203 (RJS)
5	DARRELL BENNETT,		
6	De	fendant.	
7		x	
8			New York, N.Y. September 5, 2014
9			10:15 a.m.
10	Before:		
11	HON. RICHARD J. SULLIVAN,		
12			District Judge
13			<b>5</b> 0
14		APPEARANC	F2
15 16		s Attorney for the trict of New York	
17	EUN YOUNG CHOI		еу
18	PEGGY CROSS-GOLDE	NBERG Defendant Bennett	
19	Accorney for	Defendant bennett	
20			
21			
22			
0.0			
23			
24			

(Case called)

MS. CHOI: Eun Choi, on behalf of the government.

THE COURT: Ms. Choi, good morning to you.

And for the defendant?

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: The Federal Defenders of New York by Peggy Cross-Goldenberg. With me at counsel table with your Honor's permission is Siju Moore of our office who is not yet admitted to this bar, although he is admitted in other states.

THE COURT: Mr. Moore, good morning.

Everyone, good morning.

Mr. Bennett, good morning to you.

THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, your Honor, sir.

THE COURT: As I understand it, Mr. Bennett wishes to withdraw his previously entered plea of not guilty and plead guilty to Count One of the indictment; is that correct?

Information.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: That's correct, your Honor, the information, yes, that's correct.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Bennett, before I accept your guilty plea I am going to ask you some questions here in court and the purpose of these questions here is really two-fold. First, to make sure that you fully understand your rights, that you have of a defendant in a criminal case. And second to make sure that you are pleading guilty because you

are guilty and not for some other reason. If as I am asking you these questions you don't understand the question, let me know that. I'll rephrase it or explain it better. If at any point you want to confer with Ms. Cross-Goldenberg or Mr. Moore or both before answering questions, that's fine. I'll give you as much time as you need.

In a moment I'm going to ask you to take an oath and this will be an oath that you will truthfully answer the questions that I put to you. If after taking that oath you were to make any false statements here in court that would be a separate crime, the crime of perjury or obstruction of justice. And I tell you that not to scare you but just to remind you that it's very important that you be careful and deliberate and complete and truthful in all your answers to my questions. OK?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Any questions so far?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So let me ask you to stand and if you could raise your right hand.

(Defendant Darrell Bennett sworn)

THE COURT: OK. All right. Have a seat.

Could you tell me your full name, Mr. Bennett.

THE DEFENDANT: Darrell J. Bennett, Jr., sir.

THE COURT: How old are you?

THE DEFENDANT: 29 years old.

1	THE COURT: How far did you go in school?		
2	THE DEFENDANT: Law school, your Honor.		
3	THE COURT: That's right. I remember that. Are you		
4	now or have you recently been under the care of a doctor or a I		
5	psychiatrist?		
6	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.		
7	THE COURT: OK. And tell me about that. What's the		
8	nature of the treatment that you are getting?		
9	THE DEFENDANT: It's court mandated weekly sessions		
10	with a young lady by the name of Drea Poppavick.		
11	THE COURT: That's since you were arrested in this		
12	case?		
13	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.		
14	THE COURT: Prior to that have you been under the care		
15	of or treatment of a doctor or psychiatrist?		
16	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.		
17	THE COURT: OK.		
18	THE DEFENDANT: At Harlem Hospital clinic.		
19	THE COURT: What's the nature of the treatment there?		
20	THE DEFENDANT: I was being assessed because I was		
21	having problems sleeping, your Honor.		
22	THE COURT: OK. And are you taking any medication for		
23	any of this treatment?		
24	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor. I take		
25	Seroquel.		

1	THE COURT: What is that? To help you sleep?	
2	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.	
3	THE COURT: How often do you take it?	
4	THE DEFENDANT: Nightly.	
5	THE COURT: Every night?	
6	THE DEFENDANT: Pretty much so.	
7	THE COURT: Does that drug affect your memory, your	
8	judgment, your ability to think clearly at all?	
9	THE DEFENDANT: No, sir, your Honor.	
10	THE COURT: You took it last night?	
11	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.	
12	THE COURT: Are there any other medications that you	
13	are taking at this time?	
14	THE DEFENDANT: No, sir, your Honor.	
15	THE COURT: All right. Have you ever been treated or	
16	hospitalized for any kind of mental illness?	
17	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.	
18	THE COURT: Tell me about that.	
19	THE DEFENDANT: It happened in my last year at law	
20	school. I was facing some depression and I went to see someone	
21	but I only stayed for the day.	
22	THE COURT: All right. And that was about how long	
23	ago, approximately?	
24	THE DEFENDANT: 2010, your Honor.	
25	THE COURT: All right. And was there any medication	

25

that you were prescribed in connection with that? 1 2 THE DEFENDANT: No, sir, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: All right. Have you ever been treated or 4 hospitalized for any kind of substance abuse? 5 THE DEFENDANT: No, sir, your Honor. 6 THE COURT: OK. In the last two days other than the 7 medication you took last night, have you taken any alcohol or pills or drugs or medicines of any kind? 8 9 THE DEFENDANT: No, sir, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Is your mind clear today, Mr. Bennett? 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor. THE COURT: Do you understand the nature of this 12 13 proceeding and what's going to take place here today? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, I do. 15 THE COURT: Ms. Cross-Goldenberg, do you have any 16 doubts as to Mr. Bennett's mental competence or his ability to 17 enter an informed plea? 18 MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: No, your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Ms. Choi, do you have doubts? 20 MS. CHOI: No, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: All right. Neither do I. Based on 22 Mr. Bennett's representations and responses to my questions 23 today, based on his demeanor today and on prior occasions when 24 I've seen him, based also on the representations of counsel and

the government lawyer, I find that Mr. Bennett is fully

1 competent to enter an informed plea.

So Mr. Bennett, as I understand you wish to plead guilty to see to Count One of the information, is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Do you feel you have had enough time to consider this case and in any possible defenses you might have to the charges in this information?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor, I have.

THE COURT: Have you had enough time to discuss that with your attorney, Ms. Cross Goldenberg?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: Are you satisfied with Ms. Cross Goldenberg's representation of?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, what I want to do now is I want to describe for you certain rights that you have as a defendant in the case. And I'm going do that in two ways. First I am going to ask you about a document which I think that you should have in front of you and it's called an Advice of Rights form. Do you see that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm going to ask you about that document, then I'll also ask you some questions here in open court that will cover a lot of the same grounds. And I do that because these rights are so important and your understanding is so

crucial I don't want to leave anything to chance. So let's 1 2 start with that form, the Advice of Rights form. Is that your 3 name on the second page? Is that your signature? 4 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Before you signed that document did you 6 read it? 7 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor. 8 THE COURT: And did you have an opportunity to discuss 9 it with Ms. Cross Goldenberg? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor. THE COURT: You were able to ask her any questions 11 about what that document means or what the rights described in 12 13 that document entail, is that true? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: All right. And Ms. Cross Goldenberg, is 16 your signature on the document as well? 17 MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Yes, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Before you signed it you reviewed it your 19 client? 20 MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You were able to answer any questions that he had?

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Yes.

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: If you would hand that up to me I'll mark it as a Court Exhibit. I'll call it Court Exhibit One and I'll

date and initial it.

But as I said, Mr. Bennett, sometimes what looks clear as a bell, clear as day on a two-page form when you hear the rights described in open court sometimes it prompts further questions. If that's the case here, don't be shy. We're in no rush. It's really important that you understand these rights. You're an attorney and you've studied the law so you are probably more sophisticated than most but that doesn't mean you won't have questions. And in same ways your training might make you have more questions. There's nothing wrong with that.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, the first right that I want to discuss with you is a pretty basic one. Under the Constitution you have the right to a speedy and public trial by a jury on the charges contained in the information. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: At trial you would be presumed to be innocent and the government would have the burden of introducing competent evidence to prove that you were guilty beyond a reasonable doubt; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: The jury would have to be convinced beyond a reasonable doubt and they would have to be unanimous on that

point before you could be found guilty; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: You wouldn't have to do anything. You wouldn't have to prove that you were innocent if you went to trial; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: The burden would always be on the government to prove its case, to prove your guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. Now at trial and at every stage of your case you would be entitled to be represented by attorney. And if you couldn't afford an attorney then one would be appointed for you at no cost to you; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: And in this case Ms. Cross-Goldenberg has been appointed to represent you at no cost to you, correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Now, if there were a trial then the witnesses for the government would have to come into court and they would have to testify here in your presence; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: That's because as I think you probably know, you have a right to confront your accusers and that would mean that you would have the right to hear and see the testimony of the witnesses that the government brought in.

They'd sit here in this witness box. You could see their testimony and hear their testimony. That would be your right. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: At trial your attorney,

Ms. Cross-Goldenberg, if there were a trial, would have the opportunity to cross-examine those witnesses, to ask them questions, to test their veracity, to test their accuracy, to test what they know, what they're talking about. She'd have the opportunity to object to the government's evidence if they thought there was a basis to do so; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now you yourself if you wanted to you could call witnesses and you could introduce evidence; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: You wouldn't have to. You would have no obligation to do anything. You could sit silently and do nothing. But if you wanted to you could put on a case, call witnesses, introduce evidence. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, if there were witnesses that you wanted to call as part of your case and they told you no way, I am not coming to court, that's the last place I want to be, I won't come, well, that wouldn't be the end of the story because

if they had that attitude you could issue subpoenas or have other process used to compel them to come to court and to testify truthfully under oath. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: You yourself would have the right to testify at trial if you wanted to but you'd also have the right not to testify. And if you chose not to testify the jury could attach no significance to that fact. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I would tell the jury as I do in every case that goes to trial that the defendant is presumed innocent, the defendant has no burden to put on any evidence at all. The burden always rests with the government. And if the defendant chooses not to testify you, the jury, may attach no significance to that fact. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, if the jury returned a guilty verdict against you you then would have the right to appeal the jury's verdict. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: I guess you could first ask me to overturn the jury's verdict and if I conclude there was insufficient evidence I could do that. But if I decline to do that you would then have the right to appeal above me to the Court of Appeals and ask the Court of Appeals to overturn the verdict or

2.2

to order a new trial based on errors or other things that happened at trial. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: Even now, Mr. Bennett, as you are preparing enter a guilty plea you have the right to change your mind. We haven't yet crossed the point of no return. If you told me right now, I changed my mind, I'd like to go forward with trial, that would be fine. I wouldn't be upset with you. Your lawyers would not be upset with you, nor would the government's lawyer. We all understand this is your decision and we respect whatever decision you make. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you nevertheless want to go forward with a guilty plea at this time?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if you plead guilty that means there will be no trial in this case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: You will have waived your right to a trial and all the other rights that I just mentioned. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: I guess the only exception to that would you be your right to counsel which would continue. You

wouldn't waive that right. Ms. Cross-Goldenberg would continue to represent you today through the plea and also through sentencing and through an appeal if there were appeal. And your right to appeal would not be waived. Though by leading guilty you almost certainly wouldn't be able to appeal whether or not you committed this crime. You might be able to appeal the sentence or some other things but probably not the fact of committing the crime. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: You should also know that by pleading guilty that you will then be sentenced on the basis of that guilty plea. Not today but ultimately the sentence I impose will reflect the crime that you've pled guilty to. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: I guess this last point I want to make sure you understand is that before I will accept your guilty plea I'm going to ask you to tell me what you did that makes you guilty of this crime. And the reason I do that is to satisfy myself that you are pleading guilty because you are guilty and not for some other reason. But in asking you to tell me what you did that makes you guilty of this crime I am asking you to give up an important right and that's your right not to incriminate yourself. So I want to make sure you are prepared to do that, you understand you have that right but

that you'd giving up that right in order to tell me what I need 1 to hear to accept your guilty plea. Do you understand that? 2 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: And you are prepared to do that? 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor. 6 OK. Do you have any questions about any THE COURT: 7 of these rights, Mr. Bennett? THE DEFENDANT: No, sir, your Honor. 8 9 THE COURT: All right. And you want to proceed with 10 the quilty plea at this time? 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: OK. Well, let's take a minute to talk 13 about the charge against you. You have been charged in an 14 information and I think I explained information to you before but have you received a copy of the information and read it? 15 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: You've discussed it with 18 Ms. Cross-Goldenberg? 19 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: And you are charged with in one count with 21 possessing and accessing child pornography, a violation of 22 Title 18 U.S.C. Section 2252(A) sub A Section 5B. That's what 23 you've been charged with. Do you understand that? 24 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor. 25 THE COURT: All right. Now I am going to ask Ms. Choi

to summarize the elements of this crime. If any one of these elements was not found by the jury beyond a reasonable doubt you couldn't be convicted at trial and if any one of these elements are not demonstrated to my satisfaction then I couldn't accept your guilty plea. So these are the elements. Listen carefully to Ms. Choi as she summarizes them. If when she's finished you have any questions, let me know.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

MS. CHOI: Your Honor, at trial the government would have to the prove four elements beyond a reasonable doubt.

First, that the defendant knowingly possessed or knowingly accessed a visual depiction which is defined as any photograph, film video or picture including undeveloped film or videotape and data stored on a computer disk or by electronic means which is capable of conversion into a visual image.

Second, the visual depiction was transported in or effecting interstate or foreign commerce or was produced using materials that had been transported in or effecting interstate or foreign commerce.

Third, that the visual depiction was child pornography which means the production of visual depiction involved the use of a minor engaging in sexually explicit conduct and portrayed the minor engaging in that conduct.

Fourth, the defendant knew of the sexually explicit nature of the material and the visual depiction was of an

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

actual minor engaged in sexually explicit conduct.

THE COURT: All right. So those are the elements. Do you have any questions about those elements, Mr. Bennett?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir, I don't.

THE COURT: I guess there's one other thing the government would have to prove at trial and that is that some or part of this crime took place in the Southern District of New York and that's known as the venue requirement. you understand this but the United States is divided up into about 95 districts. We're in the Southern District of New York which is Manhattan, the Bronx, Westchester, Rockland, Orange, Putnam and a few other counties. If it all took place in New Jersey then it couldn't be charged here. That venue requirement doesn't have to be proven beyond a reasonable doubt. All the other elements that Ms. Choi mentioned would have to be demonstrated beyond a reasonable doubt. Venue, the standard is lower by a preponderance of the evidence. just means that the greater weight of the evidence would demonstrate that something took place here. So that's one of the requirements or one of the other things that would need to be established. Any questions about venue?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So let me spend a minute just reminding you what the penalties are for this crime. This crime carries a maximum term of imprisonment of ten years. It

2.2

also carries a maximum term of supervised release of life, as well as a mandatory minimum term of supervised release of five years. This crime also carries a maximum fine of the greatest of either \$250,000 or twice the gross gain derived from this crime or twice the gross loss to persons other than yourself that resulted from the crime. So whichever those three alternatives is the greatest that's the maximum fine that I can impose.

In addition to a fine I can also order that you pay restitution to any person or entity that was harmed as a result of this crime and that's separate from a fine. I can also order you to forfeit any property other proceeds derived from this crime. The law basically provides that a person should shouldn't not profit from a crime so that Court is authorized to order a defendant to forfeit any proceed from the crime that they or their co-conspirators made or any property used to facilitate the crime and again that's separate from the fine, separate from restitution.

And then finally there's a \$100 special assessment that's mandatory and has to be paid and that also is separate from any fine, forfeiture for restitution.

Do you have any questions about those penalties?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: You should understand that as a result of your plea to this offense you may be required, in fact, you

would be required to register as a sex offender under the Sex Offender Notification Act; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: That could be onerous but it's just something that you should be aware of and have thought about before you plead guilty. So that's something you've considered and discussed with your attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.

a result of your guilty plea you could face the possibility of civil commitment under the Adam Walsh Child Protection Safety
Act following the completion of any term of imprisonment. That act permits the attorney general or director of the Bureau of
Prisons to certify that a prisoner approaching the end of his in incarceration is a sexually dangerous person. And if at a hearing before a court the government demonstrates by clear and convincing evidence that the inmate is sexually dangerous, then the inmate could be committed to further custody until the
Court determines that he is no longer sexually dangerous.

Again, I don't know if that would apply here but that's a statute that might be relevant given the nature of the crime.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. Are you a citizen, Mr. Bennett?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: You should understand that as a result of your guilty plea you could lose certain valuable rights such as the right to vote, the right to serve on a jury, the right to hold public office, and the right to possess a firearm. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now with respect to supervised release should understand that there are terms and conditions that will be imposed as a part of supervised release and that if you don't comply with any of those terms and conditions well then, you could be returned to jail for a full term of your supervised release without my credit for the time you'd already served on supervised release; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I should also mention that there is no parole in the federal system. So whatever sentence I impose on you that is the sentence that you will serve; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: New York state and a lot of other countries have parole and that means that the judge would impose a sentence but that later a parole order or some actor might decide this person is ready to come home sooner. That's not part of the federal system. So if I sentence you to five years, then you will serve five years. If I sentence to you

ten years, you would serve ten years. The only exception to that is you could get a certain amount of time off for good behavior. But that amount of time off would not be more than 15 percent of the total sentence and the decision as to whether you had demonstrated good behavior would be up to the Bureau of Prisons, not up to me. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: Are you serving any other sentence at this time any place?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

THE COURT: All right. The decision as to what sentence you will receive will be made by me and no one else. So no matter what anyone else has told you I am not bound by that. I have to make my own decision and exercise my own judgment in determining what is the appropriate sentence in this case; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now there are certain factors that I am required to consider. Congress has passed a statue that identifies certain factors that judges must take into account in fashioning a sentence and I want to go over what those are.

First of all, I have consider your own personal history. You're a complicated person like everybody, so I have to make sure that the sentence I impose reflects who you are. It's not based solely on the crime but on the totality of the

person before me. I have to tailor the sentence to you, the individual. So I am going to look at your entire life from your birth to the present in all its richness and complicatedness, I guess is the word I am looking for. You know, your childhood, your educational history, your work history, you psychological history, your family circumstances and family connections. All those things matte and will be relevant to the sentence that I impose.

Now I have to balance that against other factors including the facts and circumstance of the crime. This is a very serious crime obviously and it's important that the sentence I impose reflect the seriousness of the crime. So I need to make sure that the sentence is also tailored to the circumstances of this crime, not just what it's called but what happened here, what you did, what others did, what the consequence were. I have to make sure that the sentence I impose amounts to just punishment and that it also promotes respect for the law.

Another factor that's related but distinct is the need to deter or discourage future criminal conduct by you and others and the hope is that by imposing a sentence on you in this case it will send a message to you that you can't engage in conduct like this in the future and that hopefully this will be the last criminal act of your life. But also the hope is that other people might learn about your sentence and be

educated by it, that they would be deterred or discouraged from committing crimes like this in the future because they understand and recognize the costs associated with such crime. It's hard to know candidly what the future will hold or what message will be received when I impose a sentence in one case. But I think most of us recognize there is something to that and Congress has certainly directed judges like me to consider the possible future deterrence that would be associated with a sentence I impose. So I'll consider that.

Other factors I have to consider are your own needs while you are in custody. To the extent you have mental health needs or other health needs I'll make sure that those are addressed when I impose sentence.

Another important factor I have to consider is what's known as the United States Sentencing Guidelines. Have you heard of those?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, I --

THE COURT: The Sentencing Guidelines are a big book put out by a commission of judges and lawyers and experts in the field and there's a new edition each other. Sometimes there's minor amendments. The current version is about five or six hundred pages long. But the point is that this book is designed to give guidance to judges like me. So for every crime or type of crime there's a chapter in this book. And a judge is directed to go to the chapter for the relevant crime

and to make certain findings of fact. And then based on those findings of fact the judge assigns points and goes through a pretty rudimentary sort of process of addition and subtraction to come up with a number and that number is referred to as offense level.

The judge then goes to a different chapter in the book that relates to criminal history and makes a similar analysis. The judge determines whether the defendant has any prior convictions and if so when. If they're really old maybe they don't count. If there are prior convictions that result in sentences the judge will consider what the nature of the sentence was and the length of the sentence. And depending on the answers to those questions the judge will assign points, go through another process of addition to come up with a total number of points and that then leads to the judge deciding which of six criminal history categories applies. There are six. Category one is the lowest and least serious. Category six is the highest and most serious.

And then on the basis of those two findings the offense level on the one hand, the criminal history category on other, the judge then goes to the back of the book where there's a grid or a table and simply kind of just goes down this column here on the far left which is the offense level, stops when he or she gets to the proper offense level and then goes across from left to right to these other columns which are

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the criminal history categories and the judge stops when he or she gets to the appropriate criminal history category. And where the judge's finger ultimately rests well that's the range within the view of the commission that prepares this book would be appropriate. So every judge is directed to go through that process and to make these findings. Now ultimately, I am not bound by this book I am free to go higher or lower. But I am required to consider the book. I am required to make findings under the guidelines and I will do that.

And then finally I guess the last factor that I am required to consider is the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities between the sentences of similarly situated defendants. And that's sort of a fancy way of saying that before imposing sentence a judge is really asked to take a step back and to make sure that the sentence being imposed is roughly in line with what other judges have imposed on similar defendants elsewhere, recognizing that it would undermine people's confidence and undermine respect for the law if defendants who were very similar and had engaged in very similar crimes were getting wildly different sentences simply because of who the judge was or who the lawyers were. judges are asked to take that into account to make sure that the sentences roughly line up recognizing that of course no two people are exactly alike and no two crimes are exactly alike. So those are the factors that I am required to consider.

you have any questions about any of those?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. And the tough part is, of course, balancing these things. Sometimes they are intentional. So a judge's job is to consider balance, weigh and ultimately reconcile these various objectives in fashioning a sentence on an individual. So that is what I will do now that will take some time. It'll take a few months before I do that but that's the process, all right.

Now I understand there's no plea agreement in this case I have received a copy of the letter that I believe the government sent to you, Mr. Bennett. It's a letter dated

September 4 signed by Ms. Choi, addressed to

Ms. Cross-Goldenberg. It's a four-page letter. Have you seen this letter?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: You've read it?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: You've discussed it with

Ms. Cross-Goldenberg?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: This is not a plea agreement. You are bound by this letter. This is really just the government putting you on notice of the government's view as to how the sentencing guidelines apply in this case. There was a time

it.

when these guidelines were mandatory. You may know that from your legal training. That changed with a Supreme Court case around 2004 or 2005. But while they were mandatory there was a case in this circuit called U.S. v. Pimentel in which the Court said the best practice is to notify defendants of the government's view of the guidelines and how they apply in the case before a guilty plea. That practice continues even now that the guidelines are no longer mandatory. And so this is to put you on notice as what the government's view is, at least as of today. Things could change I suppose but this is their view as of today. So you've seen.

The government's view is that the offense level in this case is level 33. The government's view is the criminal history category is category one. And taken together that results in a sentencing range of 135 to 168 months but the maximum sentence here is 120 months. So in the government's view that would be an appropriate sentence under the guidelines. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, your Honor. Can I ask
Ms. Cross-Goldenberg --

THE COURT: Yes.

(Pause)

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor. I appreciate

THE COURT: That's quite all right. I told you

upfront I want you to take advantage of that if you are not sure of anything.

This is the government's view and you are free to argue that the guidelines are lower and you are free to argue lots of other things at sentencing. So this is not a restriction on you at all and it's not a restriction on me either. I'll make my own findings with respect to the other factors I've mention. My question to you is has anybody threatened you in order to make you plead guilty here today?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: Has anybody offered you anything of value in exchange for pleading guilty here today?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

THE COURT: Has anybody promised what your sentence will be?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Cross-Goldenberg, are you aware any of defense that would prevail or any reason why Mr. Bennett should not be allowed to enter a guilty plea today?

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. All right. So, Mr. Bennett, I guess at this time I'll ask you to tell me in your own words what it is that you did that makes you guilty of this crime. Sometimes I ask people to stand but the acoustics are terrible and microphone is set, so go ahead.

THE DEFENDANT: I possessed images containing child pornography on my computer in my apartment in Manhattan. I know what I did was wrong and I am very sorry and remorseful for my actions.

THE COURT: When did this take place?

THE DEFENDANT: This took place in 2012.

THE COURT: 2012, all right. And you said it was, the computer was in your apartment in Manhattan?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: The images that were contained you understood them and knew them to be child pornography as that term is defined?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: You said a moment ago that you understand that it was wrong and illegal for you to do that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Choi, is that a satisfactory allocution? Is there anything else?

MS. CHOI: Not of Mr. Bennett. The government would just note for the record that with regard to the second element the interstate and foreign commerce element, there is a NIKMIK analysis of the images that were found on the computer hard drive found in Mr. Bennett's apartment and those victims have been identified as being outside of the Southern District of New York and outside of the state of New York.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: I am sorry. I couldn't understand. You trailed off.

THE COURT: A little louder and a little slower.

MS. CHOI: The victims that were identified in the NIKMIK report -- that's the national database for the identification of victims of child pornography in cases such as this -- has identified certain known victims as being outside of the Southern District of New York and the state of New York. So as to satisfy the second element that there would be a transportation of those images through interstate commerce.

THE COURT: OK. Ms. Cross-Goldenberg, any questions about that?

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: No, your Honor. Just to clarify, I think Mr. Bennett got a little cutoff in terms of the timeframe. The timeframe in the probation which continued to February 2013, just to make the record clear.

THE COURT: OK. I think it's almost any time in that period is fine. So we'll flesh all this out more in connection with the sentencing but I think it's a satisfactory allocution.

So, Mr. Bennett, I'm going to ask Ms. Choi to summarize the government's proof, what the government would demonstrate if the case went to trial. Listen to what she has to say. If when she's finished you disagree with anything that she has said or you would like to clarify or qualify something that she has said I'll give you an opportunity to do that or

you can confer with Ms. Cross-Goldenberg and she can do it for you. But listen carefully to Ms. Choi.

So, Ms. Choi, if the case were to go to trial what

So, Ms. Choi, if the case were to go to trial what would the government demonstrate?

MS. CHOI: Your Honor, there would be testimonial evidence both from an undercover law enforcement agent to whom Mr. Bennett distributed child pornography, as well as the hard drive that was recovered from Mr. Bennett's house that contained the images of child pornography. In addition, there are post arrest statements that were made after being advised of his rights by Mr. Bennett in which he admitted to the offense conduct here.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Bennett or

Ms. Cross-Goldenberg, anything you would like to -
THE DEFENDANT: Sir, may I just ask her?

THE COURT: Sure.

(Pause)

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Anything you wish to say in response?

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Well, now let me ask you to stand, Mr. Bennett.

Mr. Bennett, how do you now plead to count one of information?

THE DEFENDANT: I plead guilty, your Honor.

THE COURT: Did you do the things you are charged with doing in the information?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Are you pleading guilty because you are quilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor, I am.

THE COURT: Are you pleading guilty voluntarily and of your own free will?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor, I am.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Bennett, because you acknowledge that you're guilty as charged in Count One of the information, because you know your rights and you've waived those rights, because your plea is entered knowingly and voluntarily and is supported by an independent basis in fact for each of the elements that we've discussed, I accept your guilty plea and I adjudge you guilty on Count One of the information. So please have a seat.

What we are going to do now is set a date for sentencing. Generally, I would set a sentencing date about probably three or four months out and that allows the probation department to prepare a report which is very important in my determining the appropriate sentence. This report is referred to as a presentence report or a PSR and it's often lengthy. It might be 30 pages long single spaced. It has a lot of

information and a lot of information about you your life history and many more details than what I know to date about you. It will also provide a lot more information about the crime that you've pled guilty to and you've sort of covered a bare minimum today. But the presentence report will go into much greater detail of what transferred. It might also include victim statements of children who were depicted. Sometimes they do anyway.

The way that information is gathered for the report is by interviewing people principally and so among those interviewed will be you. I assume, Ms. Cross-Goldenberg, you wish to be present?

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I'll direct that no interview should take place without Ms. Cross-Goldenberg being present. But I will ask you to be truthful and complete in all your answers to the probation officer. If you were to make any false statements to the probation officer, that could be a separate crime with its own penalties. It also could result in enhancements or additional points on the sentencing guidelines which would potentially increase your sentence. So I don't say that to scare you but just to remind you that it's really important that you be truthful and accurate and complete in all your answers to the probation office.

Now once the report is finished a draft will be sent

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to you, so you should read it carefully. Ms. Cross-Goldenberg will do the same. The government will get a copy as well. there are portion of the report that you disagree with, discuss that with Ms. Cross-Goldenberg. She will then convey any objections or corrections to the probation officer. The probation officer will then issue a final report and that will come to me. That will be the first one that I will see. Again, read it carefully. It may be that the objections that you had before are still there. You should then, again, he reiterate them to Ms. Cross Goldenberg and if there are any portions of the report that you and or she disagree with, she will then make those objections to me. Those will be formal objections. Ms. Choi will have the same opportunity. If there are objections then I will resolve the objections. I'll either have a mini trial or perhaps just have argument from the The real issue will be what conclusions or inferences should be drawn. So I will resolve any disputes or objections to the presentence report. I guess the one exception will be if there's some dispute or factor that I think is irrelevant, then maybe I will just -- I don't need to decide. But in any event, read it carefully and discuss it with Ms. Cross Goldenberg.

In addition to the presentence report I will also review anything else submitted to me in connection with sentencing. I suspect, that Ms. Cross-Goldenberg will submit a

sentencing memorandum that explains more about you and this crime and makes a recommendation as what would be an appropriate sentence. The government will have the same opportunity. I expect that they will take that opportunity. I will carefully read those, of course.

It is not uncommon that sometimes a defendant, himself or herself and sometimes family members or friends of the defendant wish to write letters to the Court prior to sentencing. That's perfectly fine. I am happy to get letters like that. My only request is that if you or others wish to write a letter like that, have the letters go to

Ms. Cross-Goldenberg. She'll collect them and then attach them to her submission and that way I'll get everything all at once and I can be confident that I haven't missed anything. So that's the way we should do it. But I certainly will read any letters that I get.

Once I've done all that stuff the sentencing date is January 16, 2015 at 11 a.m. I'll ask for the defense's submission by January 2 and the government submission by January --

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Your Honor, is there any way that we could do it within the usual three month span? I understand that the Court's not available but if there is some way we could do it a month earlier --

THE COURT: I'm just sort of hanging off of what

probation asked us to do. So today is September 5. They usually ask us to put this out, I guess a little over three months out to allow them the time to do the report and to allow objections to be made. So you want to do this before Christmas?

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Yes, your Honor. And actually, I am expecting a baby so --

THE COURT: Congratulations.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Thank you, your Honor. Not that that would ordinarily be appropriate to mention but I definitely want to be here for Mr. Bennett's sentencing. So --

13 THE COURT: What is your due date?

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: February 6. So the end of January is going to be getting a -- so if we could do it a little before the end of the year I will feel more confident that I will be able to be here which I think is important given the relationship that we've built.

THE COURT: I agree with that. So if we could do it before the end of the year I'll be around. So the issue for me is probation. So what's the earliest for probation? Is it three days? Give us one second. We'll get the date in a minute but let me tell you what's going to happen at that sentencing hearing. We are going to come into court, this very room. At that point I will go over with you and the lawyers

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

everything I've received to make sure I haven't left anything out. I'll tell you this is what I received and if there is something I've missed you or your lawyer should tell me. I will then go through the presentence report. If there are objections I will acknowledge the objections. I will make my findings under the sentencing quidelines and tell you what the numbers are. And then at that point I will hear from the I will allow them to expand upon whatever they may have written to me in their submissions. And to touched on, I expect that they would touch on the various factors that I've mentioned before, the factors that Congress has identified as relevant to sentencing. After I've heard from the lawyers, then I'll give you an opportunity to speak. You don't have to speak but you certainly have a right to speak before I impose sentence. And you would be very welcome to, so I will give that opportunity. Ever after that I will then tell you the sentence that I intend to impose. I'll explain my reasons for that. I'll then check with the lawyers to make sure that I haven't done anything illegal. Assuming it's not, then I will move forward to sentencing formally. So that's how the process will work.

How about Friday, December 19?

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: The 19th, that would be perfect, your Honor.

THE COURT: At two p.m. So that will be the day. If

we need to change it for whatever reason Ms. Cross-Goldenberg we'll let you know but we'll try to keep it to that date. Then I guess I'll want the submissions from the defense generally about two weeks before sentencing, so that would be December 5, I guess and then the government by the 12th. OK. So any questions with respect to the sentencing or the process by which sentencing will line up, Mr. Bennett?

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Then I guess the last issue we need to deal with is the issue of bail pending sentencing.

I've communicated with the lawyers last night and it appears that there's a dispute. The government intends to move for Mr. Bennett to be remanded pending sentencing?

MS. CHOI: Yes, your Honor. Before we do that I was just wondering if I could just have a moment to put a few things on the record with regard to the conversations I've had with defense counsel in this case?

THE COURT: Sure.

MS. CHOI: One is that one of the issues that the parties had discussed over the course of the negotiations was whether or not Mr. Bennett was going to give notice to the bar of which he is a member of the present status of his case. And it is my understanding from Ms. Cross-Goldenberg that that notification happened approximately a month ago. And other issue with regard to the forfeiture the parties have discussed

that the, just so that Mr. Bennett's on notice, the computer that was seized from his home that contains the child pornography would be forfeitable property under the applicable statute.

THE COURT: Anything -- you don't disagree with that?

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: No, your Honor. Notification,

Mr. Bennett has on his own initiative notified the bar of his

conduct on August 22 I believe and, yes, he will now or at the

time of sentencing consent to the forfeiture of the computer

that contained the child pornography. There were several other

item seized and I understand he will get those back at the

conclusion of the case because they did not contain any

contraband.

THE COURT: OK. All right. That's fine. So let's then talk about bail. Mr. Bennett has been on bail since his arrest. As far as I know he's been in full compliance with the conditions of bail with this supervision of the Pretrial Services Office. What has changed of course is the standard is now a little different. At the time of arrest it was the government's burden to demonstrate in order — the government would have to demonstrate the person was in risk of flight or danger to the community. Now the burden sort of flips because you've now pled guilty to the crime, the presumption is that you would be remanded or detained pending sentencing unless you can demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that you were

not a flight risk or not a danger to the community. So I think we all agree that's the standard at this point?

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And I referring to Title 18 of the U.S.C. Section 3143.

MS. CHOI: Yes, your Honor. Except that I think that here the crime is a crime of violence, so that the standard is actually different than the one that was articulated by the Court. I am happen my to explain that.

THE COURT: Yeah, do. I just heard about this last night.

MS. CHOI: I am sorry, your Honor. So under 3143(A)(2) that statutory provision requires defendants who have been found guilty of crimes of violence and are awaiting imposition of a sentence to be detained until there are exceptions. Under 3156(A)(4)(C), all child pornography offenses including the one the defendant just plead guilty to constitute crimes of violence. And there are exceptions under 3143(A)(2) which cannot be met under these circumstances because defendant has pleaded guilty and the Court's accepted his plea, we don't believe there is any substantial likelihood that there will be a reversal of that guilty plea. And also that the government in this case won't recommend that there should be no sentence of imprisonment imposed with regard to Mr. Bennett.

2.2

So there's only one way statutorily to avoid remand under these provisions which is under 3145(C) and that requires both that there is, as you expressed, a clear and convincing evidence standard. But as well that the defendant has shown, clearly shown that there are exception reasons that his release is not appropriate in this case and we believe that the exceptional reason standard cannot be met. I don't know if you would like us to start with that.

THE COURT: It wasn't clear to me that the crime that Mr. Bennett pled guilty to was under 3143(A)(2), so that gives -- I want to just nail that down.

MS. CHOI: Yes, your Honor. That's again under 3156(A)(4)(C) which makes reference I believe to Chapter 110 of Title 18 which includes all the child pornography offenses.

THE COURT: 3156(A)(4)(C) any -- chapter --

MS. CHOI: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And this crime that Mr. Bennett just pled guilty to falls under one of those chapters.

MS. CHOI: Chapter 110, your Honor.

THE COURT: It's always frustrating that they use chapter sections that don't peg with the code that I have in front of me.

Any dispute about that, Ms. Cross-Goldenberg?

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Your Honor, we do believe there exceptional circumstances.

THE COURT: Any dispute that this is a crime that falls under Chapter 110 and therefore is implicated under 3143(A)(2).

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So then the standard is different than the one I announced, Mr. Bennett. It's basically, a mandatory -- it's mandatory that you be remanded. The only exception is one that's been sort of judicially created. I think as much as anything else under Section 3145 under a heading of review and appeal of a release or detention order. The second circuit has nonetheless said the district court -- I guess I would be repealing or reviewing my own viewing which is metaphysical.

But in any event, I think the case law is clear that I do have the authority to allow a person who has pled guilty to be kept out on bail if there are exceptional circumstances and if they can demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that they are not a risk of flight and not a danger to the community. And the exceptional circumstances that's usually a pretty tall mountain to climb. It includes things like if a person is a cooperator and is engaged in active investigations for the government or it includes things like where someone is physically debilitated or they have family circumstances where they're sole caretaker of an infant or disabled adult or something like that. So I think I am anxious to hear what

exceptional circumstances would apply here but sort of being in compliance with supervised release -- excuse me -- being in compliance with pretrial supervision or the bail conditions or being just sort of actively employed and productively and gainfully employed is not usually going to be enough.

So, Ms. Cross-Goldenberg, I guess it's your burden in spades, so go ahead and tell me the exceptional circumstances. I think the time being I am prepared to except that he's not a risk of flight. I've not heard anything other than nature of the crime to conclude that there's any reason to think there's dangerous opinions here. Mr. Bennett has been in full compliance as far as I know with all the conditions of his bail. At least that's what Pretrial Services told me.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Well, your Honor, let me just start with the clear and convincing part, the risk of flight and dangerousness.

THE COURT: Well, can I interrupt there?

Ms. Choi, are you contesting?

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Let me say one thing, your Honor. Before that way back in October when Mr. Bennett was first released there was a, he did make an internet posting from a cellphone. That was discussed with Pretrial. He doesn't have the phone any more and there have been no issues at all related to anything like that since then. In November he did take a trip, a work trip to California. He was a

speaker at a conference. And Judge Ellis approved that travel. He had a third party custodian with him the whole time. He was prohibited from leaving hotel where the conference was.

Pretrial had given him a curfew of nine p.m. to be back in his hotel. But the keynote dinner ran over, so he was a half hour late getting back to the hotel room. And while they were attending the keynote speech Mr. Bennett and his aunt actually who was the third party had their cellphone ringers off. So view either of those as a material issue with respect to the conditions of the bail. That happened in October or very beginning of November. So for the past ten months my understanding also from pretrial is that he has been fully compliant but I want to make sure that is clear so I am not misrepresenting.

THE COURT: OK. Tell me about the exceptional circumstances.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: OK. Well, your Honor, I think that a lot of what goes into establishing what clear and convincing evidence that Mr. Bennett is not a danger, not a light risk in this case do rise to the level of exceptional circumstances. As the Court may recall from our last conference in this case, the search that was affected on Mr. Bennett's apartment and that led to the discovery of the child pornography was affected in February of 2013. He was not arrested for eight months after that search. And in those

eight months just the act of the search in the presence of a law enforcement in the apartment and understanding of that it was wrong to be doing what he was doing, in those eight months there were no issues with him viewing child pornography. He posed no danger during that time and that was before his arrest.

Your Honor, he is employed as the Court may recall. He is actually teaching down the block at the BMCC. He is teaching courses on corrections and criminal justice. And actually he just started the semester last week and so I do think even if the Court doesn't view full-time employment or regular employment as an exceptional circumstance, I think the fact the semester just began last week and that not only would he be leaving his students and school completely high and dry but a remand today would completely obliterate any chance of a career that he has following this case which already has -- as I said he's notified the bar. He will likely at least be suspended from the practice of law but at least he can continue with his second career which is teaching.

THE COURT: But the timing was somewhat under

Mr. Bennett's control and at least there was a strong

likelihood of remand that should have been considered before

starting a semester. So I am not sure what to make of that.

To not plead guilty until a week into the semester and say it's

a reason not to remand me sort of looks a little manipulative.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Well, your Honor, I can assure you that it's not. As the Court recalls from our last conference there have been negotiations ongoing for many months and to the extent there were delays in the process they were all completely beyond Mr. Bennett j's control whether we could obtain medical record and things like that were beyond our control.

With respect to dangerousness, your Honor, I don't know if the Court wants to see this but we've heard with the government previously as part of the negotiations in this case, we have had Mr. Bennett evaluated. And his the evaluation couldn't be clearer that he doesn't pose a danger. The conclusion is that he is not a pedophile. He is not dangerous, that there was no escalation in his conduct that would suggest a risk of a contact offense.

As we discussed little bit with your Honor at the beginning of this session, he was battling depression. There were other things going on in his life around the time of the search that contributed to that depression. As of this time he is not diagnosed with any mental illness but he has benefited from the treatment that he has been undergoing as a result of his Pretrial supervision. The reports from the provider that he's been seeing at the request of Pretrial show that he's been very engaged and very responsive to treatment in Pretrial, that he has demonstrated genuine rehabilitation and that he would

benefit from continued meaningful treatment. The report concludes that he is an excellent candidate for supervision, not incarceration and for treatment and rehabilitation.

And I think that there is actually a couple important points in there. One is with respect to the whether he actually poses a danger. And I think the report clearly and convincing states that he does not. But it also considered the fact that the treatment that he's been undergoing since he was arrested in October has been productive and successful and he's been very engaged in it. And the abrupt stop to that treatment if the Court were to remand Mr. Bennett now he would not receive any treatment for the foreseeable treatment. There is absolutely nothing at the MCC. There is absolutely nothing at the MDC. He would just be sitting there and that just seems counterproductive to the entire philosophy of all of the goals of sentencing that the Court just went over and to any sort of rehabilitation that we might hope to get out of this process.

Your Honor, I think another exceptional thing about Mr. Bennett is that from the beginning, meaning before he had an attorney, before he was arrested, after the search he expressed remorse for his conduct in communications with the Department of Homeland Security over the items that were seized. And again, he never contested the seizure or the forfeiture of his computer which had the images on it but he did request the return of his properly that didn't contain any

contraband. And even without an attorney he was forthcoming and remorseful and it wasn't to the extent of pleading guilty. He wasn't in that situation. He wasn't charged with a crime but he did explain to them how devastating the impact of this search and the effect of it will be made on him and the steps that he was taking to turn his life around and as I said for those eight months he wasn't even arrested. So it is very hard for me to understand how someone can be left out on the street for eight months without any pursuit of any charges against him and then all of a sudden he becomes this, that there's just no, absolutely no way to meet this burden that we have here.

And so I think, your Honor, I have two other points that what I want to give -- and I apologize for not doing this at the beginning -- but I want to introduce the Court to Jordan Powell who is in the second row. He is Mr. Bennett's good friend. He actually just started law school last month. I guess he's in his first year. And he was present at Mr. Bennett's -- I guess at the arrest actually -- and then came with him to court on the day of his presentment and agreed to serve as a third party custodian. So on the day that Mr. Bennett was released while he, until I guess the electronic monitoring and everything else was in place and Mr. Powell is more than willing to continue in that role, to report to the Court if the Court so desires and to do what the Court feels is necessary, to continue to make sure that Mr. Bennett complies

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

his with his bail continues as he has been doing for the past ten months. And I think that's exceptional, your Honor, and I think that the fact that a friend would stand up and say I have that much confidence in you. And Mr. Powell's been in touch throughout the case. He actually submitted to us a letter, a character letter regarding Mr. Bennett to submit to the prosecutor's office and the exceptional support that he's shown to Mr. Bennett is exceptional in this case as well.

Your Honor, as I mentioned in my e-mail last night the government told me on Wednesday evening that it was planning to seek remand. I have a list of about 20 cases in this district and several more in the Eastern District where in cases of this nature individuals were left out on bail pending either sentencing or sometimes after sentencing pending a voluntary I think in considering exceptional circumstances, surrender. not just in this kind of case but in all kinds of cases there's always the question of whether there's a chance that the person may not be sentenced to jail at all. And that certainly a possibility in this case. There's no mandatory jail sentence here and there are many cases in this district where judges have imposed sentences of probation or time-served in these cases. There has been as the Court knows, even the Second Circuit was highly critical in the guidelines in these sorts of So that's one thing. And that's the same analysis going to a drug case or another case that falls into that

category where individuals are left out on bail.

But, your Honor, just with respect to child pornography cases even in this district, even where judges do impose sentences of jail, Judge Castel, Judge Forrest, Judge Gardephe, Judge Batts, Judge Marrero, even your Honor have left out individuals, left them out on bail pending either sentencing or the service of their sentence.

I had a case in front of Judge Kaplan a few years ago where he sentenced the defendant to 24 months in jail and he still gave him two months to voluntarily surrender and that case contained facts that were much worse than the facts in this case that contain actual attempts to solicit a meeting with the child, actual conversation regarding actual contact with children, things that pose much more risk and danger. There's nothing like that in this case. And in fact it's the opposite in this case when Mr. Bennett has offered such things or others — possibly the undercover in this case, I don't know — offered to arrange such meetings and Mr. Bennett rejected it.

And so, your Honor, I can hand the Court a list. I can hand the Court the evaluation that I think is as I said clearly and convincingly shows that he is not a danger but it also rises to the level of seconds exceptional circumstances because in these sorts of cases it is rare to have a situation where you have no attempts to arrange meetings with children,

no conversations regarding even fantasizing about arranging meetings with children and then when you have test results that demonstrate that the individual is not dangerous and really continued treatment of the kind that is already undergoing is the best solution. And so I think all of that is exceptional, your Honor. And for all of those reasons we think that bail should be continued.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Choi.

MS. CHOI: Yes, your Honor. I think that taking what Ms. Cross-Goldenberg has said at face value those constitute arguments that go to the first prong which is the clear and convincing evidence of danger of risk of flight. I don't think any of them rise to what the Second Circuit has articulated is standard for exceptional reasons to allow for the exception to the mandatory rule.

She speaks of his employment history, his present employment and other individuals who would support him, but as the Second Circuit has articulated they've expressly rejected arguments such as going to school, being employed or being a first time offender as to United States v. Scalia 360 F.3d 401, a 2004 Second Circuit case. Courts generally do find exception under certain circumstances but usually comes up as your Honor knows when there is unique family or personal circumstances in combination with some likelihood that the conviction was in error or could later be challenged. Don't see those here.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This is an individual who lives by himself.

Ms. Cross-Goldenberg doesn't make reference to any dependents for whom there would have been to be some sort of provisions made to deal with the incarceration. And I don't think that there's any viable challenge to the that has just been accepted by the Court.

In addition, I think Mr. Cross-Goldenberg does a good job of articulating the 3553(A) factors. But they do, I think the Second Circuit case law and other courts in this district has made clear that these are not arguments that rise to high standards as your Honor has articulated. I think the Pimentel letter and the enhancements under the guidelines show the seriousness of the offense in this particular circumstance. Congress has made its determination that it is a crime of This is not a case where I think offense conduct violence. should be minimized and the reason the government will seek an incarceratory sentence is because the nature of the videos in this particular case was egregious. There were young victims. There is pain and violence depicted in some of these images. The defendant didn't just possess them but he distributed them to other individuals.

And for all those reasons a substantial incarceratory sentence would be appropriate here.

There is two other points I just want to briefly raise with regard to the no treatment argument. I don't know what

Ms. Cross-Goldenberg's basis for that assertion is. I know that there are psychological treatment options available at the MCC. At least that's my impression from other cases. And I think the rest of the argument that's she's made about the support just simply are things that the Court should take under advisement at sentencing but they do not raise exceptional circumstances under applicable Second Circuit case law, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: One moment, your Honor?

(Pause)

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Your Honor, as I said, I have a list of cases here. I can run through them if the Court wants. I know there is at least one case in the Eastern District right now, U.S. against Lee, where Judge Gleason made the finding that because the defendant was in treatment and was making progress that that counted as exceptional circumstance in that case in order to leave him out following his plea and before the court's sentencing. And in that case the defendant pled to a count carrying a five year mandatory minimum. So in that case there was going to be definitely five years in jail. And Judge Gleason recognizes where the defendant is making progress in treatment which is the goal, the ultimate goal of this whole thing is that this conduct never happened again that that is the kind of exceptional circumstance a court can take into

account.

And, your Honor, it's true Mr. Bennett lives alone.

Many arrangements would have to be made if he was remanded today. He does own his apartment. I mean, in addition to getting all of his personal affairs in order he does have a cat which is at the apartment right now. His mother actually has left or is leaving. She's not on an airplane right now on her way do a medical mission in South Africa with a church ministry that she works with. She is a nurse and she does it from time to time but she just is leaving today to go to South Africa.

So we wouldn't have her to rely on in terms of helping to take care of his things.

And the reality is, your Honor, the report which, again, I am happy to hand up, I am not quite sure why the government's is taking at face value because they have had the report for over a month but it clearly concludes that

Mr. Bennett is not a danger. And I do think that in a case like this the conclusion that there's nothing in either the case conduct, the content of the videos, the conduct that led to the arrest any of that that would suggest any kind of escalating behavior that would pose a risk of any danger to a child. So I think all of those are exceptional reasons, your Honor.

THE COURT: I think Mr. Powell wanted to say something. Maybe you should confer with him for a minute.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Sure. Thank you, your Honor.

(Pause)

MR. POWELL: Hello, your Honor.

I just wanted to speak on behalf of Mr. Bennett. I think it's pretty clear that he is not a flight risk or danger to the community but you do have something before you that you have to prove that exceptional circumstances. And I think what she mentioned is kind ever what I wanted to mention earlier is Darrell about a year ago, maybe a little less than that,

Darrell adopted this one month old cat named Button, really cute cat, takes great care of him, feeds him clips his nails, does all that great stuff. I personally couldn't take care of him. I am on campus at Fordham. I don't know anybody that would be able to take care of him and I think that represents an extenuating circumstances and maybe give you some discretion to kind of lean towards that.

THE COURT: OK. Thanks, Mr. Powell, and good luck to you in your legal studies.

I guess the new fact that's come up since your last spoke, Ms. Choi, is the cat.

MS. CHOI: Your Honor, I would presume that Mr. Powell could help Mr. Bennett make arrangements for that particular cat even if he could not himself make the arrangements. As your Honor noted, the defendant's been placed on notice of the potential for his incarceration since at least the time of his

being charged in October of last year, if not previous to that. And in Lia itself there was a situation in which there were several children which the defendant took care of that one of whom had a medical condition I believe and the Second Circuit rejected that argument saying that you should have made arrangements ahead of time and that's not sufficient for purposes of meeting the standard.

THE COURT: All right. Let me --

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: One second, your Honor?

(Pause)

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Just on that last point, your Honor, I just want to be clear. Even though the government had proposed a possible plea agreement several months ago I believe the beginning of June, possibly the end of May, the first time we heard that the government's seeking remand in this case was Wednesday evening. So to be clear, and as I said, I've personally had many cases where this hasn't even been an issue, people in my office have had cases where this hasn't been an issue. The Court itself has permitted at least one individual I know of to remain out following a plea.

THE COURT: Who are you referring to?

 $\,$  MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Your Honor, U.S. against Gin which was 09 --

THE COURT: I know the case.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: But as I said --

THE COURT: I think that was case imposed no jail time at lease initially.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Exactly, your Honor, which is a possibility in this case. I mean as I said, Judges Jones, Griesa, your Honor, Batts, Marrero, I believe many judges in this district have imposed non incarceratory sentences in cases like this. And even in cases where the incarceration is mandatory judges have permitted people to remain out following their plea. So there absolutely is no reason why Mr. Bennett all along should have anticipated that this was a done deal, especially since the government hadn't indicated it was going to pursue this until Wednesday evening.

THE COURT: OK. Well, this first hit my radar screen last night at 8:30 when I inquired as to whether there would be any seeking a remand or altering bail condition. Shame on me for not figuring out that this was a 3143(A)(2) case. I hadn't realized that so I thought I'd be applying the standard with respect to the fair and convincing evidence as to risk of flight, dangerousness and if there were the standard I think I would be continuing bail. Because we're under a different statute and because it's a statute that's mandatory remand unless there are exceptional circumstances that alters the analysis certainly, it seems to me that the main argument put forward for exception circumstances are really the fact that Mr. Bennett is engaged in productive outpatient treatment, that

he is teaching and that he's just begun a semester and that he has a cat. I don't dismiss any of those. I don't think that those are trivial. I don't think they're minor. I don't think however that they individually or collectively rise to the level of the kind of exceptional circumstances that are contemplated under the statutes here.

I think the rest of argument made by Ms. Cross Goldenberg are really arguments against the statute and arguments for the maybe a different approach in cases like this one and in cases involving treatment. But I don't think that they really advance exceptional circumstances in this case that would justify overriding what is the clear directive to Congress that crimes like this one require remand. So I have to call these the way I see them.

Mr. Bennett, it's sort of like an umpire in a ball game, you know this is what Congress has said. This is the standard and I don't think that these things rise to the level of exceptional circumstances that would justify thwarting the will of Congress that there be an automatic remand.

So I will respectfully deny the motion by

Ms. Cross-Goldenberg on your behalf and I'll remand you. And
you'll get credit for the time you served between now and
sentencing but I am afraid that the statute is clear and I
don't think the exceptions that have been offered are
sufficient to justify keeping you out.

1 MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: One second, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

(Pause)

2.2

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Your Honor, Mr. Bennett would like to address the Court. But I do just, I want to make clear that those were not the only exceptional circumstances and I do think that Dr. Barday's report which I have --

THE COURT: I mentioned the report.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: -- is exceptional. And to the extent that this is the Court's view, I would ask that the Court stay the decision today, take a copy of the report so that it has a chance to review it and that we come back next week so that the Court could have all the facts because I do think the conclusions are exceptional.

THE COURT: But staying the decision, I think the default for staying the decision is remand. The statute orders remand. The defendant's burden to articulate exceptional circumstances that would justify not remanding him. So if you want me to revisit this later or make additional arguments or submissions later then that's fine but I don't think that the result would be that I put this off for a couple weeks to consider that.

Mr. Bennett.

THE DEFENDANT: Can I just address you?

THE COURT: Certainly.

THE DEFENDANT: I would like to ask you if possibly I
can get even two days. I know that there's a huge possibility
of me being incarcerated for this. I've known that all along.
But I did not know at the time of my plea that I would be
immediately remanded or even if there was a possibility. I did
not learn this until Wednesday. I would not have taken on the
position that I have now teaching this semester. I would have
moved things. I would have gotten rid of my animal. I would
have talked to my mother about it. Everything is just there.
Even if I was given 24 hours to make it right at the school,
let them know I am leaving, to call movers to move things out
of the apartment, but I really did not prepare for this in any
way or else I promise you, your Honor, I would have come here
with given the guilty plea, having done the things that were
necessary to not put people in I mean, I rent my apartment.
I don't know who would go in. And I suppose Jordan can help me
but I mean everything's just there. It's nothing. I've done
absolute nothing. And I understand that I should have done due
diligence. I didn't know there was a possibility, your Honor.
I promise I would done the things that needed to be done. So I
am asking if even that you give me 24 hours or 48 hours and
just and I promise that I will be at whatever facility you
order me to go to.

THE COURT: Well, look. Again, I am sympathetic. I am dealing with a statute and cases that I think are pretty

clear about what the standard is. And so people obviously need to get their affairs in order and there's always loose ends that need to be tied up but it's not clear to me that's not going to be true in most cases or create incentive for people to not get their affairs in order to till after the argument. So I think there's danger to my doing that. And I am not sure what can't be done by the telephone now. You obviously need to get assistance to help wrap up the affairs.

THE DEFENDANT: It wouldn't take longer than 24 hours to have the movers get all the things out of my apartment but everything is there. I would have to find ways to pay bills. All of those things, I could find ways to do within hours. And I know it was probably — but I just want to say I really don't — I feel bad for my students that I won't be able to at least say something to the school or make it right. I mean —

THE COURT: But what -- I -- OK. What would 48 hours get you on that score?

THE DEFENDANT: Immediately leaving here I would go to BMCC and let them know that I have to resign effective immediately. I would then call movers and I would have movers come to my house immediately to move everything. I would take my kitten to the ASPCA and I would do all of that within 24 hours. But I just don't want to leave.

THE COURT: But some of those things can be done by phone.

is the closest person I have here. He is in law school and I just don't want to be a burden to everybody. It's not like I have family here where I can call up and say here's my key.

Take care of this and that. I would assume that people would just go in and evict me at some point because I am not paying. Within 24 hours I could get a lot done and I will be here. I, obviously, I would not go anywhere. I would be where ever you would report for me to be. But I just don't know what would happen to all of the things and put somebody people in a bind.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Your Honor, it would be some time before he has phone access at either of the jails and certainly it would be days if not weeks before any visitors are allowed to see him because there is a process that involves mailing a form and mailing it back and approval. So it's just not the fact that he would be able to do it right away. And I think if the Court stayed, it's not comfortable staying the remand decision, I understand the Court's position in terms of a fallback but the remand position only kicks in following a finding of guilt. So if the Court were to stay its original finding to not take effect until next week --

THE COURT: Look. I've already accepted the plea and so if this was going to be a deal breaker for the plea then I guess we should have dealt with this first. So I don't think I can take a back. I know some judges do that and it seems to me

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

a lot of that is just sort of fixing to get around an unpleasant duty imposed by a congressional statute and I don't think judges get to do that. What rises to the level of exceptional circumstances? And so is it exceptional that somebody's betting treatment? It's not that exceptional. admirable. It's good. I agree with what Ms. Cross-Goldenberg This is the goal in many ways of punishment is to make sure that a person is in a position where they don't reoffend and where they are coming out stronger than what they went in as. But I don't know that it's exceptional. At least of the facts that have been conveyed to me here today. The fact that somebody has a job, a teaching job it means there are other people who depend on you but most jobs involve people who depend on you. The timing is unfortunate. The fact that there's a cat, the fact that there's things to be done before one goes into custody is exceptional and that's fairly ordinary. I guess in some ways what is unusual -- I don't know if it's exceptional -- it didn't dawn on anybody until a day and a half ago. Again, the only reason I asked last night about an e-mail at 8:30 was -- so I am not sure why this is such a late breaking set of considerations but these are not considerations that every defendant doesn't have to deal with when they are facing a prospect of perhaps going in.

Ms. Choi, what am I supposed to do about a cat and movers and apartments and all that sort of thing?

MS. CHOI: Your Honor, to be clear, perhaps, we should have given prior notice. I presume that the facts are pretty state forward in talking to my chief but you should make sure that defense counsel is aware if it which is why the notice came on Wednesday. Your Honor, again, I don't think that these circumstances are any different for any other defendant that is convicted of a crime of violence. The statute is clear that remand is default statutory requirement. I don't think that getting your affairs in order rises to the level as articulated by Second Circuit as what constitutes an exceptional reason for him to not fall within the auspices of every other defendant should be treated against this particular standard and Congress has made that determination as such. I don't know what else there is to say about it.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: It's not the fact that
Mr. Bennett is in or receiving treatment that I think makes it
exceptional. That's an automatic requirement of everyone on
Pretrial supervision or charged. That is not what makes him
exceptional. What makes him exceptional is his engagement in
treatment, his responsiveness to that treatment and the genuine
rehabilitation that the Pretrial provider has indicated that he
has been making. And so I do think that's exceptional because
many people as they go through this process have no interest in
engaging with their treatment provider, especially one that's
court ordered. They have no interest in making any progress or

in delving in issues that may have led to their arrest or their conduct in the case and that's not Mr. Bennett and I think that's exceptional. And I think that in light of his, even the eight months that he was out that he was unpursued by authorities the eight months after his search where he demonstrated that he even without any supervision or requirements was not a danger to the community and continued to live —

THE COURT: I am not worried about the danger to the community or risk of flight.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: But that's an exceptional fact. He had eight months when he wasn't even charged with a crime and he didn't return to viewing these sort of images. That's exceptional.

THE COURT: I don't know that I am prepared to agree to that. I am going to take a break for a minute to think about this and also I what also want to confer with the marshal. So if you could just sit tight for about five minutes, OK.

(Recess)

THE COURT: I thought about this further. I also spoke to the marshal. I stand by my decision respectfully and reluctantly I understand that this has real implications for life. I will allow this. I will allow Mr. Bennett to make some phone calls. You can use the phone in the robbing room

with the marshal, will allow him before he goes to the cell block to make calls to sort of call the Borough of Manhattan Community College and others to make some arrangements. I think things like moving and apartments, that stuff doesn't does need to be resolved I would think today.

The situation of your employer and students is something that should be resolved sooner rather than later.

The cat I think that is something that is going to be require somebody like Mr. Powell to at least step up and take the cat to the ASPCA or someone else who can take care of the cat. That's something that will have to be done but with the assistance of friends, I don't think -- I am not going to delay remand for purposes of the cat. But you can make arrangements with Mr. Powell.

So, I'm sorry, Mr. Bennett. I know you are disappointed. I think that's the reality of the statutes here and that's the way I perceive my job. That is the call that is appropriate under the circumstances, OK.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. So let's do that. So the marshal's here. If you want to give your keys and things to Mr. Powell. That will enable him to get easy access to your apartment, you can do that. And then you can use my robing room where there's a phone. We can help you get that done and you can go downstairs.

All right. Thank you very much.

Mr. Powell, thank you for your being here today for your remarks and helping out. I know it means a deal to Mr. Bennett.

(Adjourned)